



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/806,967	03/23/2004	Mao-I Wu	24061.112 (TSMC2003-0571)	2328
27683 7590 01/14/2009 HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP IP Section 2323 Victory Avenue Suite 700 Dallas, TX 75219				
EXAMINER				
OSMAN, RAMY M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2457				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/14/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/806,967

Applicant(s)

WU ET AL.

Examiner

RAMY M. OSMAN

Art Unit

2457

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 November 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-17, 19 and 20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-17, 19 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 March 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. This action is responsive to amendment filed on November 20, 2008, where Applicant amended claims 1,4,13,19 and cancelled claims 6 and 18. Claims 1-5,7-17,19,20 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 11/20/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
3. Amendment to specification is acknowledged.
4. Applicant has not pointed out where the limitations of the new/amended claims are supported in the specification. (See MPEP chapter 2163.03 section (I.) and chapter 2163.04 section (I.) and chapter 2163.06) Applicant is requested to provide support for the new/amended claims.
5. Applicant argues that neither Meyers or Kim teach “denying the first router any access to the second router”.

In reply, Since Applicants specifications fails to support the amended limitation of “denying the first router any access to the second router” (see 112 1st paragraph rejection below), it is therefore broadly interpreted to mean denying a user of one network to access the other network. In this regards, both Myers and Kim teach that some users are restricted access to either Internet only or to Intranet only (example, see Kim end of ¶ 30) . Therefore, it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to deny a user using one network (i.e. Internet) to access the other network (i.e. Intranet) for the purpose of restricting a visiting-user from accessing any private information that may be located on the Intranet.

Drawings

6. The drawings are objected to because they contain the following minor informality: Figure 3 is missing labels for each element. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as “amended.” If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either “Replacement Sheet” or “New Sheet” pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

Claims 16-18 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claims recite a “computer readable medium”. This language enables the scope of “computer readable medium” to encompass a software-only embodiment.

Software per se does not fall within any of the statutory categories. The medium must be clearly hardware only. The current language does not fall within any of the statutory categories.

See MPEP Chapter 2106.01 Section I.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

8. Claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. For example, claim 1 states “denying the first router any access to the second network”. However, this is not supported in Applicants specification. There is no mention of one router denying access to another router, and how this is performed. There is only mention of denying access to particular user(s), not of a router.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 1-3,5,7-15,17,19,20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Myers et al (US Patent Publication No 2004/0122956) in view of Kim et al (US Patent Publication No 2005/0005110).

11. In reference to claims 1, 13 & 19, Myers teaches a corresponding method, computer readable medium, and system, all respectively for providing network access, and comprising:

providing a first access point for a first computing device (see Figure 1B bottom #18, and see ¶55 lines 6-9, Myers discloses a radio unit (i.e. first access point) that is for customer mobile unit (i.e. first computing device));

connecting the first computing device to a first network (Figure 1B #56 and ¶ lines 11-12, Myers discloses connecting the customer mobile unit to the Internet (i.e. first network));

providing a second access point for a second computing device (Figure 1B top #18 and ¶ 55 lines 6-9, Myers discloses a second radio unit (i.e. second access point) that is for executive mobile unit (i.e second computing device));

accessing a second router through the second access point (Figure 1A #14 and ¶45 lines 3-6, Myers discloses accessing a router portal (i.e. second router) through the radio unit (i.e. second access point)); and

connecting the second computing device to a second network (Figures 1A & 1B #52 and ¶ 51 lines 13-14, Myer discloses connecting the executive mobile unit to the Intranet (i.e. second network)).

Myers fails to explicitly teach where the first computing device accesses a first router through the first access point. However, Kim teaches that it is desirable to maintain network security for an intranet/internet system by providing service classes that permit or limit access to

the network system (¶ 12 lines 1-7 and ¶ 30 lines 17-25). Kim discloses that for example, a visitor to the system can be limited to access only the internet (¶ 30 line 26), and the visitor would access the internet by connecting from the port 312 (Figure 3 #312) to the router 304 (Figure 3 #304), where the router 304 enables internet access for the visitor (¶ 30 lines 9-16). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Myers by enabling access to a first router through the first access point, where the first router would enable the first computing device to connect to a first network (i.e. internet), as per the teachings of Kim. One would have been motivated to do so for the purpose of maintaining network security for an intranet/internet system whereby a visitor to the system is limited to only access the internet through a router within the system and whereby the visitor is restricted from accessing information on the intranet. Combining the two routers (i.e. the router of Myers and the router of Kim) into a single network would be obvious so as to enhance the versatility of the network while maintaining security of the network.

Since Applicants specifications fails to support the amended limitation of “denying the first router any access to the second router”, it is therefore broadly interpreted to mean denying a user of one network to access the other network. In this regards, both Myers and Kim teach that some users are restricted access to either Internet only or to Intranet only (example, see Kim end of ¶ 30) . Therefore, it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to deny a user using one network (i.e. Internet) to access the other network (i.e. Intranet) for the purpose of restricting a visitor user from accessing any private information that may be located on the Intranet.

12. In reference to claims 2 and 15, Myers in view of Kim teach the method of claim 1 and the respective computer readable medium of claim 13, wherein the second network is a company intranet (Myers, Figures 1A & 1B #52 and ¶ 51 lines 13-14).

13. In reference to claims 3 and 14, Myers in view of Kim teach the method of claim 1 and the respective computer readable medium of claim 13, wherein the first network is the Internet (Myers, Figure 1B #56 and ¶ lines 11-12).

14. In reference to claims 5 and 17, Myers in view of Kim teach the method of claim 1 and the respective computer readable medium of claim 13, furthering comprising providing web access filtering for the first computing device (¶ 111 lines 6-20, Myers discloses web site filtering).

15. In reference to claim 7, Myers in view of Kim teach the method of claim 1. Myers fails to explicitly teach further comprising providing a firewall to restrict access to the second network. However, Kim discloses a firewall 222 (Figure 3) that protects the intranet from external intruders (¶ 30 lines 1-3). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Myers by providing a firewall to restrict access to the second network as per the teachings of Kim. One would be motivated to do so in order to protect the intranet from external intruders.

16. In reference to claim 8, Myers in view of Kim teach the method of claim 1 furthering comprising providing data encryption for the second computing device (Myers, ¶ 53 lines 1-6).

17. In reference to claims 9 and 20, Myers in view of Kim teach the method of claim 1 and the respective system of claim 19, wherein the first computing device is a laptop computer (Myers, ¶ 41 line 5).

18. In reference to claim 10, Myers in view of Kim teach the method of claim 1 wherein the first computing device is a cellular telephone (Myers, ¶ 111 line 18).

19. In reference to claim 11, Myers in view of Kim teach the method of claim 1 wherein the first access point and the second access point belong to separate devices (Myers, Figure 1B top and bottom #18's).

20. In reference to claim 12, Myers in view of Kim teach the method of claim 1. Myers fails to explicitly teach wherein the first router and the second router belong to separate devices. However, Kim discloses two separate routers, one for the intranet connectivity and another for internet connectivity (Figure 3 and ¶ 30 lines 9-26) for enabling internet/intranet security. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Myers where the first router and the second router belong to separate devices, as per the teachings of Kim. One would have been motivated to do so for the purpose of maintaining network security for an intranet/internet system whereby a visitor to the system is limited to only access the internet through a router within the system and whereby the visitor is restricted from accessing information on the intranet.

21. Claims 4,16 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Myers et al (US Patent Publication No 2004/0122956) in view of Kim et al (US Patent Publication No 2005/0005110) in further view of Hericourt (US Patent No 6,792,461).

22. In reference to claims 4 and 16, Myers in view of Kim teach the method of claim 1 and the respective computer readable medium of claim 13. Myers and Kim fail to explicitly teach routing to a proxy server through the first router. However, Hericourt discloses routing to a

proxy server through a router where the proxy server is connected to the Internet (column 11 lines 9-18). Hericourt teaches that the proxy servers are utilized for the purpose of locally caching HTTP data from the Internet and providing the cached data to a workstation that sends a request for that particular HTTP data (column 11 lines 14-25). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Myers and Kim by routing to a proxy server through the first router as per the teachings of Hericourt. One would be motivated to do so for the purpose of utilizing the proxy servers as cache servers in order to locally cache HTTP data from the Internet and then provide it to a workstation that sends a request for that particular HTTP data, and which increases efficiency.

Conclusion

23. The above rejections are based upon the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims. Applicant is advised that the specified citations of the relied upon prior art, in the above rejections, are only representative of the teachings of the prior art, and that any other supportive sections within the entirety of the reference (including any figures, incorporation by references, claims and/or priority documents) is implied as being applied to teach the scope of the claims.

24. Applicant may not introduce any new matter to the claims or to the specification. For any subsequent response that contains new/amended claims, Applicant is required to cite its corresponding support in the specification. (See MPEP chapter 2163.03 section (I.) and chapter 2163.04 section (I.) and chapter 2163.06)

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to RAMY M. OSMAN whose telephone number is (571)272-4008. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ramy M Osman/
Primary Examiner (Temp), Art Unit 2457

January 14, 2009